

Application No. 09/161,565
Amendment "I" dated October 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action mailed August 11, 2004

REMARKS

Applicants express appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesy of the recent interview granted to Applicants' attorney on September 14, 2004. The claim amendments made by this paper are consistent with the proposed claim amendments presented during the course of the Interview. Accordingly, by this paper, claims 1, 20, 26, 38-39, and 45 have been amended, while new claims 46 and 47 have been added. The independent claims at issue are claims 1, 20, 26, 46 and 47.¹

As discussed during the interview, claims 1, 20 and 26 all include embodiments in which video and chat are displayed in separate frames in a first display mode defined by size and position of the corresponding frames. In particular, the video is displayed in a first frame and chat is displayed in a second frame, each frame having a particular position and size. As now recited in the claims, a link to a second display mode is displayed in the second frame. When the link to the second frame is selected, at least the second frame is displayed in a second frame having a different size or position, while still displaying the chat.

A link to a third display mode is also displayed in the second frame, when the second frame is displayed in the second display mode. When the link to the third display mode is selected, the second frame is then displayed in a different size and/or position than was used in

¹ The latest Office Action, mailed August 11, 2004, considered and rejected claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-10, 20-21, 26-28 and 30-45. Claims 1-3, 5, 8-10, 20-21, 26-27 and 30-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison (U.S. Patent No. 5,694,163) and claims 6 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison in view of Schein (U.S. Patent No. 6,323,911). Inasmuch as Schein is only used to reject dependent claims that should now be found allowable for at least the reasons presented herein with regard to the independent claims, the merits of Schein and the rejections based thereon will not be addressed at this time. Nevertheless, this should not be construed as acquiescing to the purported teachings of Schein or any other art. To the contrary, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the purported teachings and prior art status of Schein, as well as any other art presented in the last action, at any appropriate time, should it arise.

Application No. 09/461,565
Amendment "F" dated October 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action mailed August 11, 2004

both the first and the second display modes. In other words, the third display mode is different than both the first and second display modes.

As discussed during the interview, neither Harrison, nor the known maximize and minimize buttons, when considered alone or in combination teach or suggest the foregoing invention. In particular, Harrison fails to disclose any links to different display modes or any types of different display modes, whereas the known maximize and minimize buttons correspond to only two different display modes in which the content of the windows is displayed. Clearly, the known maximize and minimize buttons fail to suggest a third display mode that is different than both the first and second display modes and that can be used to display content and that is accessed by selecting a button that is displayed from the second display mode. Support for these claim amendments is drawn from the disclosure corresponding to Figures 5 and 6, as well as other portions from the specification.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 20 and 26 are patentable over the rejections of record, as well as all of the corresponding claims that depend therefrom. It will be noted, as discussed during the interview, that claims 38, 39 and 45 have been amended to promote the clarity, consistency, and accuracy of the claim language.

The last independent claims 46 and 47, which are introduced by this amendment, correspond to embodiments in which the link to the second display mode causes both the first frame and the second frame to change. The art of record also fails to teach this claimed embodiment. In particular, Harrison fails to disclose any link to different display modes, and the known maximize and minimize buttons fail to disclose or suggest that a link will change the size and/or position of any frame except for the frame to which they pertain. The disclosure

Application No. 09/461,565
Amendment "F" dated October 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action mailed August 11, 2004

supporting these new claims is drawn from the portions of the specification corresponding to Figures 6 and 7.²

For at least these reasons, as presented during the interview, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-10, 20-21, 26-28 and 30-47 are distinguished from the art of record and are now ready for allowance.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 8 day of October 2004.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorneys for Applicant

Customer No. 47973

RDN:JCJ:cm
W:\14531\82.19\CM0000004232V001.DOC

² The embodiments recited in claims 46 and 47 are also related to previously presented claims 34, 35 and 43-45, which should not have been rejected in the last action for at least the reasons presented during the interview and as recited above in this paper regarding the changes made to both frames in response to selecting the link.